



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

frappante l'opinion générale. Cependant on reconnaît vite que les observations de l'auteur viennent d'un fonds très considérable de lecture, et d'une opinion formée indépendamment de celle des autres; en tout cas, l'accusation de plagiat ne saurait l'atteindre, et c'est là un mérite dont il faut tenir compte.—Parlant de Corneille et de Racine, M. Fortier nous dit que la différence des époques où paraissent ces deux génies explique la grande différence qui existe entre eux. C'est concéder beaucoup à l'influence du *moment* et en tirer des explications que notre devoir est de rechercher également dans l'individualité.—Dans un parallèle entre Bossuet et Fénelon, nous voyons ces deux écrivains proclamés égaux en génie. C'est évidemment faire tort au premier. Le chapitre des femmes auteurs est un des plus intéressants et des mieux composés; cependant on proteste intérieurement et on se demande si ce n'est pas violer légèrement les lois de la proportion que de consacrer à Mesdames de la Fayette, de Sévigné, de Maintenon et de Staël, un bon quart de ce que l'on a à dire sur la littérature française aux dix-septième et dix-neuvième siècles.

De tous les auteurs du dix-huitième siècle, Rousseau semble avoir la préférence de M. Fortier; il y a, peut-être, un peu trop de détails biographiques dont quelques uns manquant d'exactitude rigoureuse. Rousseau ne dit pas avoir jamais témoigné l'intention d'embrasser le catholicisme, d'autres la témoignèrent pour lui.—Les quatre pages consacrées à la poésie nous convainquent aisément de son peu d'importance à cette époque. La comédie occupe une place plus considérable et l'on peut se faire une idée assez complète de son évolution après Molière.

M. Fortier nous avertit lui-même qu'il s'est contenté de nommer les principaux écrivains du dix-neuvième siècle, et d'appeler l'attention sur les ouvrages les plus importants. Le chef-d'œuvre de Flaubert ne peut trouver grâce à ses yeux; il est, dit-il, d'une immoralité profonde. Citons l'opinion de Sainte-Beuve qui, après avoir reproché à Flaubert de ne s'être pas arrêté en deça de certains détails, ajoute: "le livre a une moralité; l'auteur ne l'a pas cherchée, il ne tient qu'au lecteur de la tirer, même terrible."

Pour ce qui a rapport au style et à la composition il ne nous semble pas que M. Fortier ait pris dans son 'Histoire' autant de précautions que dans son livre des 'Sept grands auteurs.' La phrase est parfois chargée d'éléments qui retardent sa marche et produisent, à la lecture, la sensation d'un effort. Il n'a pas su éviter, dans la mesure du possible, la répétition des mêmes sons et des mêmes expressions. Les mots *popularité*, *populaire*, *caractère* sont quelquefois employés où nous préfererions *réputation*, *renommée*, *en faveur*, *fréquenté*, *personnage*. Les verbes subissent quelquefois, dans l'emploi de leurs temps, des changements trop soudains et, ça et là, on a peine à saisir l'enchaînement des détails. Tout le monde, sans doute, conviendra que dans un abrégé d'histoire littéraire, où l'on passe en revue tant de noms, où un si grand nombre d'ouvrages demandent des détails analogues, où, faute d'espace, tout se condense sous la plume de l'écrivain, il est à peu près impossible de ne pas montrer quelques défaillances. Nous pensons que M. Fortier a atteint le but qu'il s'est proposé, et que son livre contribuera à l'étude de la littérature française.

JOS. A. FONTAINE.

Bryn Mawr College.

NEW LIGHT ON THE ROMANTIC MOVEMENT.

The Beginning of the English Romantic Movement. A Study in Eighteenth Century Literature by WILLIAM LYON PHELPS, A.M. (Harvard), Ph.D. (Yale). Instructor in English Literature at Yale College. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1893. 12mo, pp. viii, 192.

THE old-fashioned history of literature was rather tame. It ran to metaphors and glittering, elusive generalities; and worst of all, it repeated, without examination, traditional estimates and opinions. It was Mr. Saintsbury who first showed us in his admirable manual on French Literature, what a history of literature might become in the hands of a man with an independent point of view and unflagging industry. He did not venture to pass opinion except on books that he had actually read. As a natural result his history, whether you agree with his conclusions or not,

is unfailingly fresh and stimulating. This principle is the only sound one, and so obvious that to state it seems almost unnecessary. One of its latest applications is in Doctor Phelps's study, and the result is a most readable and interesting book. Not only are fresh facts brought to notice, but they are stated with that convincing firmness of touch which goes with new-found and interesting knowledge. Besides the book is noteworthy as among the first-fruits of the new spirit which is showing itself in the study of English on this continent. The material is investigated not for the sake of grammar or linguistics but literature; the methods of research are rigidly scientific; and the aim is human,—more precise and fruitful knowledge of literature as the expression of a nation's life. At the same time there is a distinct effort in the direction of form. The writings of the new school shall not only discuss literature; they shall also be literature.

Dr. Phelps begins properly, by defining his terms; and naturally finds some difficulty in settling the meaning of "romantic." After passing various definitions in review, he concludes that the three essential qualities of romantic literature are "Subjectivity, Love of the Picturesque, and a Reactionary Spirit." He next discusses the chief characteristics of the Augustan literature; and touches lightly on its distaste for enthusiasm, its distrust of deep feeling, its tendency to exalt the letter above the spirit, its reverence for the classical, its preference of the town to the country, its tendency to satire and its disregard of the older English literature. But strong as Augustan prejudices were, there were signs even at the beginning of the century of reaction against them. Dr. Phelps finds even in Pope low murmurs of the personal note; while, in Croxall, Parnell, Allan Ramsay and Hamilton, there is frequent expressions of deep and genuine passion. Not only is a protest heard here and there against the regnant spirit, there is also protest against the regnant form, the heroic couplet. The protest took various shapes, as blank verse, octosyllabics, the sonnet. But the most significant of all was imitation of Spenser; and the discussion of this aspect of the movement makes one of the

most important chapters in the book. Instead of vague general statements, sliding into metaphors which are neither to hold nor bind, an orderly arrangement of plain facts forms an unbroken chain of evidence. What is true of Spenser is true also of Milton. He is read and imitated by many writers who find their chief inspiration in the vein of melancholy running through 'Il Penseroso.' The Love of the Picturesque in Romanticism turns the eyes of men naturally and irresistibly towards the past. An interest springs up in Gothic architecture, in the age of chivalry, in the national ballads, in the fragments, genuine or fictitious, of ancient poetry. Horace Walpole, Bishop Percy, Macpherson and Gray all play important parts in this portion of the story. Gray, Dr. Phelps argues with great ingenuity, exemplifies in his own career the gradual change in taste from classicism to romanticism. And, finally, the results of the whole discussion are neatly brought together in a short concluding chapter.

Such is the book in outline. I have purposely refrained from mingling expression of opinion with the summary. The plan should stand by itself; the criticism will follow in its proper place. The style is decidedly the man himself in this instance, being vivacious and full of decision. Dr. Phelps has views of his own, he has a right to them, and he does not hesitate to say what he thinks. When, for instance, in his discussion of Gray's sterility, he finds himself unable to agree with Matthew Arnold, he dissents with an emphasis which is quite startling. It is as when the disinherited knight's spear-point smote the Templar's shield at Ashby-de-la-Zouche, till it rang again. There is much to be said on his side. His explanation cannot fail to impress the reader as by far the more reasonable of the two. Again, one seldom comes across quotation put to better use than honest Harry Bailey's famous interruption to Chaucer's tale on page 109. At times, however, this sprightliness carries the writer away. Why be so severe on poor Lloyd (p. 79)? Why call him "rascal"? Would it not be better to emulate that leader of the British House of Commons, who made his follower substitute for "murderous ruffian" (a term bestowed on an opponent

in the heat of debate) the synonym, "excited politician?" Surely, it would be enough to call Lloyd a "Bohemian." Still, vivacity is too rare a failing in books of this kind to seriously quarrel with any of its manifestations. There are a few minor defects, however, which call for correction. Occasionally, one lights upon such doubtful English as, "comparing the relation between Milton, Spenser and Pope" (p. 8); or a careless phrase like "took a lady for a ride on the river" (p. 61); or a mixed metaphor like "the new emphasis laid on all this evidently contained seeds of the Romantic movement" (p. 100). Such blemishes, though, no doubt, due to hasty composition, interfere with the reader's pleasure, and should not re-appear in a second edition.

As already more than hinted, Dr. Phelps holds his opinions strongly and his manner of expressing them is the reverse of shilly-shally. Such a manner is certain to provoke opposition; and it is well that it should. Discussion of some of the issues raised cannot fail to be fruitful. Many, for instance, would wish to see his characterization of Addison modified, and fuller justice done to the great conservative work of the Augustans. But these are minor matters. To my thinking, there is one serious defect in the plan of the book, but one that can be remedied by the addition of a new chapter. Ample space is given to the discussion of Spenser's influence and Milton's, while to the king of romanticists no separate chapter is devoted. Not only that, but this singular statement is made regarding him.

"Shakspeare was commonly regarded as the greatest English writer, although he was handled in a way that would nowadays be thought sacrilegious; and even though admired, he was not very widely read and by no means always understood" (p. 15).

All the facts point the other way. So far from being neglected or unappreciated by the Augustans, it is precisely with the rise of Augustan taste that an intelligent interest is taken in Shakspeare. The seventeenth century had merely reprinted the first folio, errors and all, three times, and, after the Restoration, travestied the great dramatist or put him aside for Dryden or Davenant. But as soon as the classic spirit had definitely asserted itself,

Shakspeare was edited in something like modern fashion. As early as 1709 Rowe's monumental work was ready for the press. He had been at pains to establish a text and to gather together the scanty facts of Shakspeare's life. It must not be forgotten that to Rowe, Betterton, Aubrey and Davenant we owe nearly everything that is known of the great dramatist's personal history. A second edition of Rowe was required by 1714, and nine years later we find the acknowledged chief of the Augustans, Pope himself putting his name to a new and magnificent edition. He did his task very ill; and his errors were pointed out by an editor of genius whom we are only learning to value. Theobald's exposure of Pope's deficiencies, Pope's pillorying of Theobald in the 'Dunciad' are significant facts. It is still more significant that though Pope made him a laughing-stock and had all the wits and all the town on his side, Theobald's first edition put down his clever rival's, and sold over twelve thousand copies. Both issued second editions, but Theobald's remained the favorite, and is to this day the basis of all sound editing. It held its ground even against Hanmer's (1744) and Warburton's (1747) and was a third time reprinted in 1757. In all, there are *eight* distinct editions of Shakspeare in the first half of the eighteenth century, as against *two* of Spenser. Dr. Phelps must have for the moment lost sight of these well-known facts when he wrote Shakspeare "was not very widely read." Further, Dr. Phelps's book itself contains evidence as to the influence of Shakspeare upon the romanticists. There are various complimentary references to his genius in quotations used for other purposes; see pp. 90, 91, and notes, p. 85. Of Upton's imitation of Spenser, Dr. Phelps says, "many phrases are taken almost bodily from Shakspeare," and quotes in illustration (p. 72, note).

"And ever and anon the sheeted Dead
Did squeak and gibber thro' the myrksome Air."

See also, pp. 16, 17. Not only that Shakspeare was read, but that he was admired and imitated by the early romanticists is plain from Dr. Phelps's unconscious statements. That he was a much more potent force in bringing

on this movement will appear, I feel certain, from a second examination of the literature. And the diligence which has produced the admirable chapter on Spenser can easily supply the missing one on the greatest of the Elizabethans. The treatise will gain thereby in depth and completeness.

In spite of what I cannot but consider an oversight, Dr. Phelps has obtained most important results. In no previous work has the origin of the Romantic movement been traced so carefully; nowhere else has the story of its rise been set down so fully and in such plain terms. He has also made clear what was only previously suspected,—the supreme influence of the Elizabethans both in matter and form, and the early rise of Romantic tendencies. The long array of imitators of Spenser is surprising and convincing; and the connection between the followers of Milton and the "grave-yard" school is fully established. But the method used is even more commendable than the results obtained. For hearsay, we have fact; and for showy hypothesis, painstaking research. The power of such a method to help us to knowledge in this particular field is only dawning upon us. Dr. Phelps's use of it has given us a book which every student of the romantic movement will find indispensable.

ARCHIBALD MACMECHAN.

Dalhousie College.

FRENCH DRAMA.

Louis XI, tragédie par CASIMIR DELAVIGNE, edited with introduction and notes by H. W. EVE, M. A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Head Master of University College School, London. Pitt Press Series. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1894.

THE life of Louis XI appeals to English speaking people for several reasons: he has been a favorite character with some of the modern English tragic actors,—notably, Mr. Irving; his portrayal by Scott in 'Quentin Durward' has made him known to a larger circle. In his early years he viewed that great struggle which ended in the overthrow of the English power in France in 1453; his reign also represents one of the most critical periods of French

history—a period during which the feudal power in France was broken, and the feudal nobility made subservient to the royal power. It was a time of consolidation, reconstruction, and of reform, and one full of dramatic action.

Delavigne's drama is highly interesting to the student of literary history; it shows how he regarded the crusade begun by Victor Hugo in his preface to Cromwell in 1827. 'Louis XI' was represented for the first time in 1832, but the author had conceived the plan nine years earlier. In his early works Delavigne was a follower of the classic style; in his later works, he was somewhat influenced by Romanticism, but never sympathized with it in all respects; in 'Louis XI' he adheres to the old versification, but does not feel bound by the unities of time and place; in short, he is neither a follower of the old style nor of the new, but chooses what he considers best from both, hence the work is important in the history of the transition.

This edition is preceded by an introduction on the life and works of Delavigne and an account of his relation to the literary history of his time. It is a matter of regret that such a literary introduction is not considered a requisite in all annotated editions of foreign classics; no student can study a work intelligently who does not know its relation to literary history. The introduction also contains an account of the life of Louis XI, of the state of France at his accession, of his triumph over the feudal nobility, together with some remarks on the other characters of the play. Twelve pages of the introduction are devoted to an explanation of French versification; the text is followed by seventy-eight pages of notes. Those of an historical and explanatory nature are very valuable for a college edition, but many of the grammatical notes might have been omitted, since students would already have encountered the difficulties here treated, in earlier reading, before being introduced to such a work as this. In a few cases the editor has ventured upon derivations, but, in this field, his statements are, in some instances, not the etymologies at present accepted; among these are *donc* which is derived from *tunc, oui* from *hoc illud*, *néant* from *ne ens*. The explanation of the *v* in such words as